



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,814	09/28/2001	Bruce Alexander	118030	3066
26389 7590 12/21/2007 CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC 1420 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 2800 SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347				
EXAMINER				
PESIN, BORIS M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2174				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/21/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/966,814

Applicant(s)

ALEXANDER ET AL.

Examiner

BORIS PESIN

Art Unit

2174

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 10/04/2007.

Claims 1-40 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 25, 29, and 37 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 10/04/2007, Claims 1, 25, 29, and 37 were amended.

This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-16, 19, 23-27, and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crater et al ("Crater," US005982362A) in view of Edlund et al. (US 6085227).

As per independent claim 1, Crater teaches a method for interacting with a remote device comprising: obtaining a request corresponding to controlling the remote devices (column 3, lines 58-64); generating a graphical user interface responsive to said request, the graphical user interface being operable to control the remote device, wherein controlling said remote device includes accessing said remote device and

issuing instructions (column 3, lines 37-45 and lines 58-64); transmitting remote device control data corresponding to said user control instructions (column 7, lines 25-36); and obtaining remote device data generated by said remote device (column 7, lines 25-36).

Crater does not teach dynamically issuing instructions to manipulate an operation of the remote device; obtaining user control instructions from said graphical user interface for controlling the remote device, wherein user-controlled instructions for controlling the remote device are submitted by one authorized user at a time; and in response to receipt of said remote device control data, obtaining remote device data generated by said remote device.

Edlund teaches teach dynamically issuing instructions to manipulate an operation of the remote device (Column 3, Lines 35-52); obtaining user control instructions from said graphical user interface for controlling the remote device, wherein user-controlled instructions for controlling the remote device are submitted by one authorized user at a time (Column 4, Lines 58-63); and in response to receipt of said remote device control data, obtaining remote device data generated by said remote device (Column 3, Lines 35-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Crater with the teachings of Edlund and include a method to manipulate a remote device and restrict access to the number of users who can access a remote device at one time with the motivation to provide the user a simpler method of accessing a device without other users interfering with the access and provide for greater versatility in accessing devices that might not be normally accessible.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches that generating a graphical user interface includes dynamically generating a graphical user interface (column 8, lines 20-25).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Crater teaches dynamically generating a graphical user interface includes: identifying a remote device corresponding to said request (column 8, lines 19-36); selecting a program module corresponding to said identified remote device from a plurality of program modules, said program module operable to control said remote device (column 8, lines 19-36); generating a screen interface including said selected program module, said program module including a graphical user interface component corresponding to said requested remote device (column 8, lines 25-36).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 2, Crater teaches dynamically generating a graphical user interface includes: identifying two or more remote devices corresponding to said request (column 9, lines 54-62, i.e. – data from many remote devices can be displayed together); selecting a program module corresponding to each identified remote device from a plurality of program modules, said program modules operable to control said remote device (column 9, lines 54-62); generating a single screen interface containing all program modules, said program modules operable to generate graphical user interface components corresponding to each requested remote device (column 9, lines 23-26 and lines 54-62).

Claim 30 is similar in scope to claim 4, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Crater teaches that control instructions control the operation of all of said remote devices (column 2, lines 63-68).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 2, Crater teaches that the graphical user interface is a Web page (column 8, lines 19-25).

Claim 31 is similar in scope to claim 6, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 2, Crater teaches obtaining a request corresponding to controlling one or more identifiable remote devices includes: obtaining a request for monitoring data corresponding to said remote device (column 8, lines 19-25).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 2, Crater teaches wherein obtaining a request corresponding to controlling one or more identifiable remote devices includes: obtaining a request to transmit data to said remote device (column 7, lines 25-36).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 8, Crater teaches that the transmitted data causes said remote device to move (column 7, lines 25-36).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches transmitting control data includes: transmitting a request for accessing data from said remote device (column 10, lines 49-59); and transmitting authorization for access to said remote device (column 10, lines 49-59).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches obtaining remote device data generated by said remote device includes: obtaining real-time data generated by said remote device (column 3, lines 12-15).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches obtaining remote device data generated by said remote device includes: obtaining pre-recorded data generated by said remote device (column 3, lines 15-23).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches that the remote device is a video camera, and wherein obtaining remote device data includes obtaining video data from said video camera (column 3, lines 12-23).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 13, Crater teaches that transmitting control data includes transmitting data manipulating said video camera (column 7, lines 25-31).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches that transmitting data includes manipulating operating parameters of said remote device using said graphical user interface (column 9, lines 4-12); and wherein obtaining remote device data includes obtaining remote device data generated by said remote device based on said manipulated operating parameters (column 9, lines 4-12).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, Crater teaches that the graphical user interface includes a graphical means for manipulating said operating parameters of said remote device, said graphical means operable to receive user inputs corresponding to said manipulation (column 3, lines 62-65 and column 7, lines 25-31).

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches obtaining user control data includes obtaining a request for manipulating operating parameters of said remote device (column 3, lines 62-65); and wherein transmitting remote device control data includes translating said request into device specific commands, and transmitting

said device specific commands to said remote device operable to change said operating parameters of said remote device (column 7, lines 25-36).

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions (column 3, lines 24-35).

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches a system having a processor, a memory, and an operating environment (column 3, lines 24-35).

Claim 25 is similar in scope to claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 25, Crater teaches that the computing device is a server computer (column 9, lines 42-47).

As per claim 27, which is dependent on claim 25, Crater teaches that the computing device is a client computer (column 9, lines 62-66).

Claim 37 is similar in scope to claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 38, which is dependent on claim 37, Crater teaches a proxy server in communication with said client computer and said server computer, said proxy server operable to process and store monitoring data generated by said remote device (column 9, lines 15-20 and column 7, lines 32-36, i.e. – camera output signals are stored on a network host and transferred to a local server to be displayed on a client system).

As per claim 39, which is dependent on claim 37, Crater teaches that the server computer and said client computer are in communication via the Internet (column 7, lines 37-49).

As per claim 40, which is dependent on claim 37, Crater teaches that the server computer and said client computer are in communication via a dedicated device control network (column 7, lines 37-49).

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crater et al. ("Crater," US005982362A) in view of Edlund et al. (US 6085227) further in view of Amini et al. ("Amini," US006698021B1).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 16, the teachings of Crater- Edlund in regards to claim 16 have been discussed above. Crater teaches that the remote device is a video camera (column 3, lines 12-23). Crater does not disclose a graphical means that is a graphical controller including graphical representation of a compass having an origin and directional indicators.

Amini teaches a graphical means that is a graphical controller including graphical representation of a compass having an origin and directional indicators (figure 10C, element 1032 and column 16, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Crater- Edlund with a graphical means to control a video camera using a compass representation, as taught by Amini, with the motivation to provide an intuitive user

interface capable of controlling camera motion relative to any initial camera position
(column 16, lines 1-6)

Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crater et al. ("Crater," US005982362A) in view of Edlund et al. (US 6085227) in view of Amini et al. ("Amini," US006698021B1) in further view of Brush, II et al. ("Brush," US# 5732232).

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 17, teachings of the combination of Crater- Edlund and Amini in regards to claim 16 have been discussed above. The combination of Crater- Edlund and Amini do not disclose that the graphical controller is operable to communicate the intensity of said manipulation, said intensity based on the distance away said user input is from said origin.

Brush teaches that the graphical controller is operable to communicate the intensity of said manipulation, said intensity based on the distance away said user input is from said origin (column 3, lines 28-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of the combination of Crater- Edlund and Amini with a means to indicate the intensity of user input based on the distance the user input is from the origin, as taught by Brush, with the motivation to more efficiently translate user input into desired outcomes on a graphical user interface and to enable a greater degree of user control of the interface (column 4, lines 65-67)

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 18, Crater teaches remote device data generated by said remote device based on said changed operating parameters is real-time data (column 3, lines 12-15).

Claims 21 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crater et al. ("Crater," US005982362A) in view of Edlund et al. (US 6085227) further in view of Lemons et al. ("Lemons," US006504479B1).

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 1, the teachings of Crater- Edlund in regards to claim 1 have been discussed above. Crater- Edlund does not disclose that the remote device is selected from the group consisting of intrusion detection devices, card readers, door strikes and contacts, access control panels, bar code scanners, video cameras, still cameras, and microphones.

Lemons teaches that the remote device is selected from the group consisting essentially of intrusion detection devices, card readers, door strikes and contacts, access control panels, bar code scanners, video cameras, still cameras, and microphones (column 6, lines 65-68 and column 6, lines 41-57 and column 5-6, lines 47-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Crater- Edlund to include intrusion detection devices, card readers, door strikes and contacts, access control panels, bar code scanners, video cameras, still cameras, and microphones, as taught by Lemons, with the motivation to monitor and control all aspects of an integrated security system (column 2, lines 30-33).

Claim 28 is similar in scope to claim 21, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crater et al. ("Crater," US005982362A) in view of Edlund et al. (US 6085227) further in view of Nail (US# 5758340).

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 1, the teachings of Crater- Edlund in regards to claim 1 have been discussed above. Crater- Edlund does not disclose that the remote device can be locked, thereby preventing the simultaneous submission of instructions by more than one user.

Nail teaches that the remote device can be locked, thereby preventing the simultaneous submission of instructions by more than one user (column 3, lines 6-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Crater- Edlund with a means to lock a remote device to prevent simultaneous submission of instructions by more than one user, as taught by Nail, with the motivation to prevent data inconsistency (column 3, line 6).

Claims 29-31 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crater et al ("Crater," US005982362A) in view of Hesselink (US 6499054) further in view of Edlund et al. (US 6085227).

As per independent claim 29, Crater teaches a method for dynamically generating a graphical user interface for controlling at least one pre-selected remote

device comprising: obtaining a request to control at least one pre-selected remote device from the client device (column 3, lines 58-64); and selecting one or more program modules from a plurality of program modules in response to said request and corresponding to said request to control the at least one pre-selected remote device, said one or more program modules operable to control said remote device (column 7, lines 25-36); transmitting a screen interface with said one or more program modules (column 7, lines 25-36); wherein said screen interface containing said one or more program modules is operable to generate a graphical user interface for controlling at least one pre-selected remote device when loaded within a browser application on the client device (column 9, lines 62-66).

Crater does not teach a computer system including a client device in communication with a central server via a communication server and obtaining a request to control at least one pre-selected remote device from a remote device by a central server. Hesselink teaches a computer system including a remote device in communication with a central server via a communication server and obtaining a request to control at least one pre-selected remote device from a remote device by a central server (i.e. Figure 1A, and Figure 1B). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Crater with the teachings of Hesselink and include a central server to control a pre-selected device with the motivation to provide the user with feedback and minimal delay (Hesselink, Column 1, Line 60).

Crater and Hesselink do not specifically teach a system wherein controlling includes accessing the at least one pre-selected remote device and dynamically issuing instructions to manipulate an operation of the at least one pre-selected remote device.

Edlund teaches, a system wherein controlling includes accessing the at least one pre-selected remote device and dynamically issuing instructions to manipulate an operation of the at least one pre-selected remote device (Column 3, Lines 35-52. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Crater and Hesselink with Edlund and include a system to dynamically issue instructions to manipulate a remote device with the motivation to provide the user greater range of devices that are available to him, since some devices are really expensive, it would be convenient for them to be remotely available to many people.

As per claim 30, which is dependent on claim 29, Crater teaches a method wherein said request to control includes two or more pre-selected devices, and wherein said screen interface is an integrated screen interface containing said program modules (column 9, lines 54-62, i.e. – data from many remote devices can be displayed together), said program modules operable to generate a graphical user interface corresponding to said requested remote device when said single screen interface is loaded on a browser application (column 9, lines 23-26 and lines 54-62).

As per claim 31, which is dependent on claim 29, Crater teaches that the graphical user interface is a Web page (column 8, lines 19-25).

As per claim 35, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions (column 3, lines 24-35).

As per claim 36, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches a system having a processor, a memory, and an operating environment (column 3, lines 24-35).

Claims 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crater et al. ("Crater," US005982362A) in view of Hesselink (US 6499054) in view of Edlund further in view of Lemons et al. ("Lemons," US006504479B1).

As per claim 32, which is dependent on claim 29, the teachings of Crater, Hesselink, and Edlund in regards to claim 29 have been discussed above. Crater and Hesselink do not explicitly disclose that the pre-selected remote device is a video camera having pan-tilt-zoom functionality, and wherein said graphical user interface is operable to control said pan-tilt-zoom functionality of said video camera and to view data from said video camera.

Lemons teaches that the pre-selected remote device is a video camera having pan-tilt-zoom functionality, and wherein said graphical user interface is operable to control said pan-tilt-zoom functionality of said video camera and to view data from said video camera (column 5, lines 60-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Crater, Hesselink, and Edlund with a means to control the pan-tilt-zoom functionality of a video camera and view data from the video camera, as taught by Lemons, with the motivation to control the function of remote video camera (column 3, lines 9-11) and provide the user with easy to access information that would not normally be easily accessible.

As per claim 34, which is dependent on claim 29, the teachings of Crater, Hesselink, and Edlund in regards to claim 29 have been discussed above. Crater, Hesselink, and Edlund do not disclose that the pre-selected remote device is a motion detector.

Lemons teaches that the pre-selected remote device is a motion detector (column 7, lines 5-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Crater, Hesselink, and Edlund to include intrusion detection devices, card readers, door strikes and contacts, access control panels, bar code scanners, video cameras, still cameras, and microphones, as taught by Lemons, with the motivation to monitor and control all aspects of an integrated security system (column 2, lines 30-33).

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crater, Hesselink, and Edlund further in view of Launey et al. ("Launey," US005086385A).

As per claim 33, which is dependent on claim 29, the teachings of Crater, Hesselink, and Edlund in regards to claim 29 have been discussed above. Crater does not disclose that the pre-selected remote device is a temperature control device, and wherein said graphical user interface is operable to control said change in temperature of said temperature control device. However, Crater disclose monitoring of temperature (column 8, lines 26-31).

Launey teaches that the pre-selected remote device is a temperature control device, and wherein said graphical user interface is operable to control said change in

temperature of said temperature control device (column 16, lines 48-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Crater, Hesselink, and Edlund with a means to control the temperature through a user interface, as taught by Launey, with the motivation to provide a simple interface to control the environment of a building (column 3, lines 10-13).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/04/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Edlund does not teach obtaining user control instructions from said graphical user interface for controlling the remote device, wherein the user control instructions for controlling the remote device are submitted by one authorized user at a time. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Edlund teaches,

The user interface provided by the browser 108 and client command processor 110 allows an individual user to operate and view the current status of the remote device 106. Typically, such an interface is specific to a particular device 106 or instrument, which may comprise a scanning tunneling microscope, a telescope, a robot in a remote location, or other remotely-located device. Essentially, this

interface reflects the status of a live experiment and can be invoked by multiple users simultaneously at multiple client computers 102. (Column 3, Lines 36-45). Clearly, based on that passage and the reference as a whole, Eldund teaches obtaining user control instructions from said graphical user interface for controlling the remote device, wherein the user control instructions for controlling the remote device are submitted by one authorized user at a time.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually (See Applicant's arguments with respect to Crater), one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BORIS PESIN whose telephone number is (571)272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2174

BP

/David A Wiley/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174